

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 25-28.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 16, 19, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by WO 01/70550 to Hinz (U.S. Patent No. 6,866,489 is referenced herein as an English language equivalent) in view of US 6,361,295 to Schuller et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

"To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. §2143. Additionally, as set forth by the Supreme Court in KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., No. 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007), it is necessary to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the prior art elements in the manner claimed.

Independent claim 16 recites: "[a] supply device for the supply of pressure fluid into at least one vehicle brake comprising: a piston movably arranged in an accommodating member, a carrier bearing a non-return valve arranged coaxially with respect to the piston for ventilating a working chamber into which the piston plunges, a resetting spring arranged between the carrier and the piston, a multi-part cage assembly comprising a plurality of separate cage parts for accommodating the resetting spring into the plurality of separate cage parts, wherein the resetting spring is caged and simultaneously elastically preloaded under the relative displacement of the plurality of separate cage parts, and fastening means for locking the multi-part cage assembly comprising at least two locking arms formed on a first cage part and at least two holes formed on a second cage part, each locking arm of the first cage part having a resiliently deformable and unconstrained end configured for engaging a hole of the second cage part upon relative displacement of the first and second cage parts."

The Office Action acknowledges that Hinz fails to teach fastening means for locking the multi-part cage assembly comprising at least two locking arms formed on a first cage part and at least two holes formed on a second cage part, each locking arm of the first cage part having a resiliently deformable and unconstrained end configured for engaging a hole of the second cage part upon relative displacement of the first and second cage parts. The Office Action cites to elements 72 and 80 of Schuller et al. as corresponding to the recited locking arms and holes,

however, applicants respectfully submit that the references, even if combinable fail to teach each element of the claimed invention.

Schuller et al. explains at column 3, lines 32 - 45, that "[t]he closure part 68 is joined to the bush 26 via a snap connection: On its bush bottom 64, the bush 26 has a radial collar 72, which forms an undercut 74 on its side remote from the closure part 68. . . . Three radially inward-protruding snap-on nipples 80 are impressed into the hollow-cylindrical edge 78, distributed over the circumference; they engage the radial collar 72 of the bush 26 from behind and in this way keep the closure part 68 on the bush bottom 64." (emphasis added).

Schuller et al. does not teach or suggest any holes for receiving locking arms, but instead teaches a radial collar 72. Furthermore, Fig. 2 of Schuller et al. shows that the ends of the nipples 80 end at the plane of the hollow cylindrical edge 78. As shown in Fig. 1 thereof, the free ends of the nipples 80 do not engage the radial collar 72, but instead an intermediate bend portion of each nipple 80 engages the radial collar 72. For at least these reasons, the cited references fail to teach or suggest each element of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, the Office Action cites to Fig. 12 of Hinz as showing first and second cage parts 36 and 63 and, based solely on this figure, concludes that Hinz teaches a press fit engagement between parts 36 and 63 which is cited as equivalent to the claimed fastening means. Additionally, the Office Action indicates that the spring is caged and simultaneously elastically preloaded under the relative displacement of the parts 36 and 63.

Examining corresponding U.S. Patent No. 6,866,489, the only discussion of element 63 is at column 7, line 61 through column 8, line 3. The '489 patent explains "[i]n addition to this structure, a filter 63 can be provided at the valve seat carrier 9 that is not designed together with the spring retainer cup 36 but as a separate component part in this arrangement." (emphasis added). There is no teaching that the components 36, 63 are press fit together or that the spring 4 is preloaded. The only teaching is that the components 36 and 63 are separate components. These components 36 and 63 may simply be positioned relative to one another and the spring 4 only preloaded after assembly relative to the piston 3.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to teach or suggest each limitation of the claimed invention. It is respectfully

submitted that claim 16 and the rejected claims that depend from claim 16 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of claims 16, 19, 23 and 24 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes an interview, either telephonic or in person, will advance the prosecution of this application, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to arrange the same.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Glenn M. Massina, Reg. No. 40,081  
Attorney for Applicants

GMM/mc

Dated: September 8, 2009

☒ P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.